- 6 -

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on March 20, 2006. Claims 29-38 are standing for examination. The Examiner has rejected claims 29-38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alegre et al. (US 6,199,113) hereinafter Alegre.

Applicant has again carefully studied the prior art cited and applied by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejections and statements in the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein amends the claims to clarify that the site destination is a destination specified by the user. Applicant presents valid arguments clearly showing that the reference of Alegre fails to read on applicant's invention, as amended. The specification is also amended to correct an error.

In the previous response applicant amended the claims to recite that the request for authentication from the user comprises a network destination, specified by the user. The Examiner has taken a broad interpretation of the limitation stating in the "Remarks" portion of the Office Letter that, "The examiner has fully considered this argument but views a request for authentication as a request for just that: access, authentication, and verification. A request to log in occurs with the request. Applicant is reading into the broad diction of claims that the request for authentication is a request for a specific network destination log in page. The user sending the request expects to go through authentication as evidence by the sending of the username and password identification information with the request."

Applicant responds by amending the claims to positively recite that the user specifies at least one network destination site known to the user as capable of accepting the user's username-password pair included in the request for authentication and a username-password pair for the user, and the server, in response to the request, causes navigation to the at least one site and attempts a login with the username-password pair, successful login comprising authentication.

As previously argued, Column 5, lines 23-31 of Alegre specifically teaches that in response to a request from the user, browser 314 sends a request, such as a URL, over

- 7 -

Internet 114 (step 412), and waits for a response (step 414) by entering a wait state for a period of time (step 416). If the request is for trusted network 138, web host 210 receives the request and returns a login page to client browser 110 for display (step 418). The login page prompts the user for user authentication information, such as UID and PWD.

Applicant argues that the above teaching of Alegre clearly shows that the login page destination is not provided by the user. The login page is served to the user and the destination of the login page is unknown and invisible to the user prior to receiving it from Web host 210.

Applicant believes claims 29 and 34 are patentable, as amended and argued above. Claims 30-33 and 35-38 are then patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

All of the claims are clearly patentable over the art cited and applied, because the art, while many of the navigation and log-in techniques may be shown in isolated instances, does not teach the elements claimed in association. It is therefore respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Blake Earl Hayward

By *[Donald R. Boys]*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457